

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-15, 18-21, 23, 25-38, 40, and 42-46 are pending. In the present amendment, Claims 4-6, 10, 12, 28-30, and 34 are amended; Claims 1, 16, 17, 22, 24, 39, and 41 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and new Claims 45-46 are added. Support for the present amendment can be found in the original specification, for example, in Figs. 1-3, and in original Claims 16 and 17. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to; Claims 24 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; Claims 2-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 7, 8, 10, 21, 22, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shoemaker (U.S. Patent No. 5,363,114) in view of Nesic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,406, hereinafter “Nesic”); Claims 6-15, 18-25, and 30-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Veerasamy (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0034926) in view of Nesic; Claims 2-5 and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Veerasamy in view of Nesic and Maoz (U.S. Patent No. 5,068,670); and Claims 16-17 were indicated as including allowable subject matter. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 16-17.

With respect to the objection to the drawings, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed “dipole is disposed on an outside of the coating or layer,” recited in Claim 13 is shown in Figs. 4-5. With respect to the “free main surfaces” of Claim 16 (now included in Claim 10) and Claim 34, the phrase “free main surfaces” is amended to recite “one of the outer surfaces.” Further, Claims 22, 24, 39, and 41 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection of Claims 24 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, it is noted that Claims 24 and 41 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is moot.

In response to the rejection of Claims 2-44 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the noted informalities in the Office Action are hereby corrected. In view of the amended claims, it is believed that all pending claims are definite and no further rejections on that basis are anticipated. However, if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with the Examiner in a joint effort to derive mutually acceptable language.

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), it is noted that independent Claims 10 and 12 are amended to include the features of allowable Claims 16 and 17, respectively. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of independent Claims 10 and 12 be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejections of Claim 6 and 30, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest that “a conducting track acting as a shielding line is disposed both above the first conducting track and below the second conducting track,” as recited in Claims 6 and 30. The Office Action rejects Claims 6 and 30 as unpatentable over Veerasamy in view of Nesic. However, the Office Action ***does not cite*** any specific portions of the cited references asserted to disclose the features of Claims 6 and 30. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 6 and 30 be withdrawn.


New Claims 45-46 are added by the present amendment. Support for new Claims 45-46 is found in the original specification, for example, in Fig. 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added. New Claims 45-46 depend on Claims 10 and 12, respectively, and thus are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to

Claims 10 and 12. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that new Claims 45-46 be allowed.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)

Adnan H. Bohri
Registration No. 62,648